

LP
F

5012

889

m12



3 9004 01390830 3

SPEECH

OF

Mr. D'Alton McCarthy, M.P.

DELIVERED ON THURSDAY, DEC. 12, 1889,

AT OTTAWA,

Under the auspices of the Ottawa Branch of the

EQUAL RIGHTS ASSOCIATION.

The following is a verbatim report of the speech delivered by MR. MCCARTHY, Q.C., M.P., on Thursday evening, December 12th, under the auspices of the Ottawa Branch of the Equal Rights Association. Previous to MR. MCCARTHY rising, the following resolution, on the motion of Mr. P. D. Ross, seconded by Mr. Geo. Hay, was unanimously carried :

That this meeting desires :

1. To express its hearty approval of the course pursued by MR. D'ALTON MCCARTHY, Q.C., M.P., on the question of the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act.

2. And to record its sympathy and approval of the policy promoted by him of abolishing the dual language system prevailing in Manitoba and the North-West Territories.

3. And this meeting avails itself of this opportunity of expressing the opinion that in our own Province the use of the French language as the language of instruction in the Public Schools should be abolished and for ever prohibited, and that no undecided measure for obtaining this end will be satisfactory to the people of Ontario.

MR. MCCARTHY, who was received with prolonged cheering, said, Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have to thank you, in the first place, for the cordial manner in which you have received the resolution which has been moved and seconded so

ably by the two gentlemen who have just addressed you. I have felt for a long time that I would like very much, if an opportunity were afforded me, to address the citizens of the capital of our Dominion. I have, it is true, had that opportunity, in one sense, more than once, but my engagements are such that I have not always my time at my own disposal, and therefore I have not been able, until this evening, to gratify my own great wish and come here in obedience to the call, and under the auspices of the Equal Rights Association (cheers).

I have to thank you most cordially for approving of my course in Parliament on the question of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and still more for your endorsement, if I may consider you have endorsed it, of the policy I am now promoting, and which I shall continue to promote, viz.: the abolition of the dual language system and of Separate Schools in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. (Loud cheers.) I am not so much concerned at present with the local question. I think that very naturally and more properly belongs, in the first place, at all events, to the gentlemen of the Local House, who ought to be, and are, no doubt, more familiar with matters of that kind than I can pretend to be. At the same time, as a citizen of Ontario—of the Dominion—I heartily endorse the sentiment which the meeting has given utterance to—that we ought, and ought at once and for all time, to put an end to the teaching of our children, or any portion of our children, either French Canadian or English, in any other language than the language of the country in which we live. (Cheers.) I say further, but I do not propose to trespass upon your time or patience to-night in discussing the point, that we will not support or tolerate in this Province, no matter which political party may advocate them, any half-hearted measures to carry that object or reform into effect. (Loud cheers.) Before entering upon the more serious part of the discussion that is before us, I would ask why it is you are assembled here to listen to me? and why I am here to-night to address you under the auspices of the Equal Rights Association? It is quite true, as the mover of the resolution has stated, that I have been classed as a Conservative of the Conservatives. I have supported since Confederation the political party that is now in power in the Dominion, and I announce here to-night, that although I have separated myself in some measure from them, that I am still in accord with the general policy of the Government; differing from them, however, on a particular measure—the disallowance of the Jesuits' Estates Act, and I may yet have to differ from them more

and more as I proceed in the course I have announced. I have this to say, no matter what the consequences may be, that my first allegiance is to the principles I have lately adopted, and my second allegiance to the political party I have hitherto supported. (Loud cheers.) I hope they will not come in conflict. I do not wish to dis sever myself from my political friends and political associations, but where they do clash, I see the path of duty for me lies clearly in supporting and maintaining the resolutions which form the basis of the Equal Rights Association. (Prolonged cheers.) Now, sir, why are we here under the auspices of the Equal Rights Association? We all have our political partyisms, and why have we, more or less, separated ourselves from those party alliances? Why do we stand to-night on what may be called a new platform? and why do we join in what may be looked upon as a new departure? I think it is right and proper we should face that question fairly and honestly. If we are not able to give a satisfactory answer to our own consciences; if we are not able to satisfy the common sense of the Dominion; if in very truth we are not right in the course we are taking, our Association and the aims and end of the Association will come to naught. We have to look this question squarely in the face, and I propose to tell you to-night why I believe the programme of the Equal Rights Association is a necessity, why we are called upon to separate ourselves, more or less, from political parties—why I have, to some extent, separated myself from former political associations—and stand by the colors which we hoist as part of that programme. (Applause). A little history may be necessary—perhaps a little tedious history, ladies and gentlemen—in order to fully appreciate the position of Canada to-day. You know from what has been stated to you, that this was at one time New France, an appanage of the kingdom of France. We know that it passed under British rule in the cession of 1763, mainly in consequence of the victory of Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham. We know that at that time there was, so to speak, a handful of French Canadians living in and inhabiting this country. We also know that they were living in a civilized state and under a code of laws which had to be recognized by the conquering power. By that cession certain rights were guaranteed to the French, and by those rights so guaranteed to them by treaty—which is the highest description of human law—we desire to be bound. We desire to be governed by that law, since a rule of international law binds us to give effect to a treaty made by two independent powers; but there

has been a constant effort on the part of French Canadians principally, to misrepresent and distort and create false impressions—I will not say wilfully, because many of those who may have done so, have doubtless been as ignorant of it as many of us until quite recently were—as to the terms of that treaty. It is not two years since I heard a gentleman occupying a high position in Quebec, say that beyond all question the people of Quebec were not only granted the freedom of their religion, but their institutions and laws by the Treaty of Cession. An examination of that treaty—as we have had to unearth that old musty document during the last twelve months, and we may have to look at it more or less again—satisfies every fair minded man that all that was guaranteed was the freedom of their religion, and that only so far as the laws of Great Britain would permit. (Applause). No word is to be found in that document about their language. No word is to be found about their laws. And whatever suggestions of that kind were made by the defeated party to the conquering general, were simply rejected, and the answer given was: “You will become His Majesty’s subjects!” I do not stand here on this platform to advocate the slightest interference with the Roman Catholic church, or to justify or palliate discourtesy to those who profess that faith. I do not go on the letter of the law, as might be done in strictness, and say that the manner they are permitted to exercise their religion under the direct guidance of His Holiness of Rome, is not according to or permissible under the strict language of the treaty, or according to law. We claim for Roman Catholics, as for all in the Dominion, most perfect and absolute freedom in every shape and form; but we deny to any religious sect or body, no matter what that may be, that it shall intrude itself into the sphere of the civil power (cheers). I wish that my Roman Catholic friends would understand from me, and from every person who adopts the Equal Rights Platform, that there and there alone do we differ from them. It is a great pity, but it is true, that our Roman Catholic friends are looking upon us as making an attack on their religion, and are drawing themselves up in an attitude of defense, and hurling back on us abuse, as if we were attacking the tenets of their faith. I trust no words will ever fall from my lips that will not indicate that I have the highest possible respect for the faith that any of my fellow subjects may be brought up to entertain.

But when any religious body attempts to enter on the domain of politics, when it asserts to itself, or presumes to assert to itself the right to say, “This is a matter of morals, this is a matter

of religion and therefore a matter as to which we have the right to interfere," as, for instance, it was the practice and the habit, in the City of Toronto, of the late Archbishop to communicate to the members of his church that the question of school education was a matter of religion appertaining to the church, and that consequently in school matters the church was supreme—and if what I have read in the paper here to-night be correct, a similar authority is claimed by the Archbishop of Ottawa with reference to educational affairs here—at that assumption we draw the line (applause). There lies the difference between us, and there alone. That is all I propose to say in reference to the Roman Catholic question.

An Act was passed after the Treaty of Paris, to which I have referred, which greatly enlarged and extended the privileges of the French Canadians. It was the first blundering piece of legislation for which we are indebted to our ancestors, and which has proved, and is going to prove a terrible incubus on this country. The British government of that day, we know, were not guided by great wisdom, or else probably there would have been no revolution on this continent, and the whole of North America to-day would have been under the Union Jack. Much statesmanship was not exhibited by them in their deeds or acts; and among these acts of unwisdom was the Quebec Act of 1774. - The secret history of that Act we do not perhaps know, but we see the result. The result is what? That not merely was the religion of the French Canadian guaranteed to him, subject always, of course, to the King's supremacy as declared by the Supremacy Act of Queen Elizabeth's time, but in addition to that their own peculiar laws were granted to the French Canadians, and not merely their own peculiar laws, but their Church was created or constituted into a quasi-State Church, and they had from that time forth the power which they exercise to this day, of exacting tithes by force of law, and raising other moneys for the Church establishment in a manner denied to all the rest of the community, and which we would not for a moment submit to in any church or denomination we belong to. (Loud cheers.) That was the beginning of this series of troubles. If it had not been for the tithe system, the Province of Quebec to-day would probably have quite as many English speaking inhabitants as French speaking inhabitants; because a direct premium was offered to the Hierarchy of the Lower Province to buy out, or get rid of, the English Protestant, the Scotch Protestant, or everybody but those of their own religion, so that the property

held by them should become subject to this law passed in 1774, known as the Quebec Act, and afterwards widely extended—I may say enormously extended—by the Parliament of United Canada. So that what was practically but a small part of that Province which was subject to the laws of French Canada and subject to the peculiar institutions of that Church, was, by the law of the Parliament of United Canada, extended throughout the whole length and breadth of the great Province of Quebec. (Hear, hear.) From the moment of the passage of the Quebec Act, everywhere the anxiety of the Hierarchy was to keep the French Canadian as a French Canadian, to prevent him intermingling with the other races, because, forsooth, if allowed to intermingle with the English, there was a possibility of his being converted or perverted, whichever you choose to call it, by which the Church would be deprived of the benefit otherwise to be obtained from the law and system which this iniquitous Quebec Act imposed upon us. (Hear, hear.)

Lack of time prevents a very close investigation of the matters of which I am dealing, but we must go a step further. All present have heard of the rebellion of 1837-38. We know that Lord Durham was sent out here for the purpose of investigating the causes of the difficulties prevailing, not merely in Upper Canada, as it was then called, but in Lower Canada.

We know, and if we do not know we ought to know—because there is no more useful historical work to be referred to than the great report of Lord Durham—that he found the difficulties of the Lower Province were not the difficulties of the Upper Province; that he found the difficulties there were race difficulties, whatever name was given them. Whatever pretext or pretence, whatever was the motive or apparent motive, probe it to the bottom and you found a contest going on between the English speaking inhabitants of the Province of Quebec and the French Canadians. Lord Durham said this must cease. Great errors had been committed by the British Government already. When they found the 60,000 or 65,000 French Canadian people here in this enormous country it was impossible that they could recognize their language and their laws, considering the sparseness of the population in relation to the enormous territory which they inhabited; that as there were but two courses open to the conqueror—either to respect the nationality of the actual occupants, recognize the existing laws, preserve the established institutions, or to treat the conquered territory as one open to the conquerors; or regarding the conquered race as entirely sub-

ordinate, and as speedily as possible to assimilate the character and institutions of its new subjects to those of the great body of the Empire.

Let me quote Lord Durham's exact words, pregnant as they are with the very highest practical statesmanship :

“There are two modes by which a government may deal with a conquered territory. The first course open to it is that of respecting the rights and nationality of the actual occupants ; of recognising the existing laws, and preserving established institutions ; of giving no encouragement to the influx of the conquered people—and, without attempting any change in the elements of the community, merely, incorporating the Province under the general authority of the central government. The second is that of treating the conquered territory as one open to the conquerors, of encouraging their influx ; of regarding the conquered race as entirely subordinate ; and of endeavouring, as speedily and as rapidly as possible, to assimilate the character and institutions of its new subjects to those of the great body of its Empire. In the case of an old and long-settled country—in which the land is appropriated—in which little room is left for colonization—and in which the race of the actual occupants must continue to constitute the bulk of the future population of the Province—policy as well as humanity, render the well-being of the conquered people the first care of a just government, and recommend the adoption of the first mentioned system ; but in a new and unsettled country, a provident legislator would regard, as his first object, the interests not only of the few individuals who happened at the moment to inhabit a portion of the soil, but those of that comparatively vast population by which he may reasonably expect that it will be filled ; he would form his plans with a view of attracting and nourishing that future population—and he would, therefore, establish those institutions which would be most acceptable to the race by which he hoped to colonize the country. The course which I have described as best suited to an old and settled country, would have been impossible in the American continent unless the conquering State meant to renounce the immediate use of the unsettled lands of the Province ; and in this case, such a course would have been additionally unadvisable—unless the British Government were prepared to abandon, to the scanty population of French whom it found in Lower Canada, not merely the possession of the vast extent of rich soil which that Province contains, but also the mouth of the St. Lawrence, and all the facilities for trade which the entrance of that great river commands.”

The latter course ought to have been pursued and the troubles of 1837 would not have been found to exist. Well, sir,

he had a scheme. He had a plan, and his plan is to be found here recorded in his report. He said:—"What am I to recommend to the powers that sent me?" There were two courses open. He said: "This country must be made English. Lower Canada must, at the earliest possible moment, be brought into line as an English speaking community. In their own interest and in the interest of all the people who are likely, in the not very distant future, to be here, there must not be these race difficulties and race troubles. Considering merely their own welfare as a people, and while it is not yet too late, they must be made, as far as possible, and as much as possible, English speaking, English in feeling and true British subjects." (Cheers.) Well, what were the means he proposed for attaining this end? Here was the great Upper Province, at that time computed to have a population of 400,000 English speaking people, and there was the Lower Province, with the larger population of between 600,000 and 700,000, of whom it was computed 420,000 were French Canadians. Unite them together in one province. In order to accomplish the end in view, give them an equal number of representatives. Ere long the Upper Province will increase in population so rapidly that it will have a larger population: but, in the meantime, a certain apparent injustice will be done to the Lower Province by giving to Upper Canada an equal representation. The great object is to bring them together. The English are sure to outnumber the French before long and the French will certainly be brought into harmony with their English speaking neighbors. They will gradually, or rapidly as he hoped, adopt English methods and English ways of thought, and this country will be, as it ought to be, an Anglo-Saxon community. This, in brief outline, was Lord Durham's method of doing away with the difficulties which he found in what is now the Province of Quebec.

First, and above all things, then, he held that the French language must be stamped out. Now, remember, ladies and gentlemen, that there was no law, up to 1841, permitting the use of the French language. It is not to be found in the treaty; it is not to be found in the Quebec Act of 1774; it is not to be found in the Act of 1791, by which Legislative institutions were granted to the Province of Lower Canada, then created. That was the time of the separation of the two Provinces, and at the time at which I have brought you down to—1840—the French Canadian had no guarantee for his language. Now, by resolution of the Legislative Assembly and by force of his ma-

jority in the Assembly, he had ordained that it should be permissive to use the French language in the proceedings of the Assembly, but there was no statute law allowing it. Lord Durham realized that so long as the use of the French language was permitted, so long as they were permitted to be educated in their schools in the French language, to be instructed in the literature of France instead of the literature of England, they would remain French in feeling; and no matter what they might call themselves, they would be French to all intents and purposes. Is there any shadow of doubt that Lord Durham was right? (Hear, hear.) Is there a shadow of doubt that between these two races, of all races in the world, if they are ever to be united, it must be by the obliteration of one of these languages and by the teaching in one of these tongues. (Hear, hear.) Why, sir, is it not known to us all, that for one hundred years before 1763, the great contest in the world—the great wars—because there was nearly one hundred years of wars, for what? For the colonial Empire here and the great colonial Empire of India. The great duelists in those wars were the French and the English. The battle was fought to determine as to who was to possess the North American continent; hence our history is filled with contests, in this very land we live in, between the French and the English. At the end of that one hundred years—at the time of the treaty of Paris in 1763—it was definitely decided that out of that great long contest England had emerged victorious—(prolonged cheers)—that the North American continent was practically to be Anglo-Saxon, and that it, as well as India, was to be under the rule and dominion of the British Empire. (Renewed cheers.) Can you expect that the French Canadian, learning of the exploits of his own countrymen as contrasted with the feeble efforts of the cowardly Anglo-Saxon who was defeated on so many fields and driven from so many posts—(loud laughter)—thus nurtured and brought up, is likely to love the British name or the English speaking inhabitant, the descendant of his conqueror? (Hear, hear.) If he is ever to be a Briton in thought and feeling, he must learn to cherish, not merely our institutions, but our glorious past, and to look forward with us to a still more glorious future. (Cheers.) Therefore it was that Lord Durham pointed out, and if I had time to read you some extracts which I have here, I would prove to your satisfaction that even fifty years ago, although the science of language was not understood then as it is to-day, that there is no factor equal to language to banl people together, and unfortunately, I think

we may say, as is demonstrated in our own case, that nothing is more calculated to keep people asunder. I have here the statement of a great man who has devoted his lifetime to the investigation of this subject. If you will permit me I will read it to you. It is from a lecture delivered by Prof. Müller, the great scientist on the subject of language, at the University of Oxford, within the last twelve months. What does he say?

"These may seem but idle dreams of little interest to the practical politician. All I can say is I wish it were so. But my memory reaches back far enough to make me see the real and lasting mischief for which, I fear, the Science of Language has been responsible for the last fifty years. *The ideas of race and nationality founded on language have taken such complete possession of the fancy, both of the young and the old, that all other arguments seem of no avail. Why was Italy united? Because the Italian language embodied Italian nationality. Why was Germany united? Because of Arndt's song, 'What is the German Fatherland?' and the answer is given, as far as sounds the German tongue. Why is Russia so powerful a centre of attraction for the Slavonic inhabitants of Turkey and Germany? Because the Russian language, even though it is hardly understood by Servians, Croats and Bulgarians, is known to be most closely allied. Even from the mere cinders of ancient dialects, such as Welsh, Gaelic, and Erse, eloquent agitators know how to fan a new, sometimes a dangerous fire.*"

And, if I might add to my citations, already too many, as I must admit, let me quote again from Lord Dunham's report on this very matter, the influence of language as he found it, from actual experience in the Province of Lower Canada:

"The two races thus distinct, have been brought into the same community, under circumstances which rendered their contact inevitably productive of collision. The difference of language from the first kept them asunder. * * * * *

"No common education has served to remove and soften the differences of origin and language. The associations of youth—the spirit of childhood—and the studies by which the character of manhood is modified are distinct and totally different.

"As they are taught apart, so are their studies different. The literature with which each is the most conversant, is that of the peculiar language of each, and all the ideas which men derive from books, come to each of them from perfectly different sources. The difference of language in this respect produces effects quite apart from those which it has on the mere intercourse of the two races. Those who

have reflected on the powerful influence of language on thought, will perceive in how different a manner people who speak in different languages are apt to think ; and those who are familiar with the literature of France, know that the same opinion will be expressed by an English and French writer of the present day, not merely in different words, but in a style so different as to mark utterly different habits of thought. This difference is very striking in Lower Canada. It exists, not merely in the books of most influence and repute, which are, of course, those of the great writers of France and England, and by which the minds of the respective races are formed, but it is observable in the writings which now issue from the Colonial press. * * *

“ The difference of language produces misconceptions yet more fatal even than those which it occasions with respect to opinions, it aggravates the national animosities, by representing all the events of the day in utterly different lights.”

Is there anything truer than that ? Well, sir, realizing that, desirous of making this a British country, the Imperial Parliament passed a Union Act, and brought together in the year 1840 or 1841 Upper and Lower Canada, which had been separated by the Act of 1791. If you look at that Act, you will find a clause emphatically declaring that in the Courts of Law, in all proceeding in Parliament, in all official documents, that one language and one language alone should be used, and that should be the English tongue. (Cheers.) That was in 1840. That was in consequence of Lord Durham's report, which was accepted by the statesmen of England, and which has always been looked upon as a singularly able and exhaustive document. He hoped by uniting the two Provinces, by bringing them together, by putting down and stamping out the French language, that the end which every patriot must desire would be accomplished ; and that end would have been the Anglicizing of the French Canadians, and making this into a truly British country. The Parliament of 1840 did all it could to repair the injury of 1774 : but, gentlemen, it was not very long before our politicians undid it all—(hear hear). Now, do not let me be too hard on politicians. My redemption, if I am yet redeemed—(laughter)—my repentance, at all events—has been rather of short date. I did not realize, and I do not know that others see the matter in the same light as I do now—because I think if they did they would act as I propose to act—that in the course our public men are pursuing on both sides of the House, and which had been pursued for the last forty years there was any great wrong. We gathered around our political chiefs and adopted and supported

a course of trade policy and other political objects which appeared to us best calculated to develop this great country, and we forgot—at least I forgot, and I assume that others were equally careless—that while we were hoping to build up this country by the expenditure of millions, while we were taking in the great North-West, which millions of people are yet to inhabit, while we were building the Canadian Pacific Railway at a cost far beyond what a country so young and comparatively poor seemed able to afford, while we were advancing at this sufficiently rapid pace of prosperity, we were forgetting the “one thing needful to the consolidation of the Dominion; but all this time we were forgetting that this great trouble, which was an enormous difficulty in 1837, had quadrupled itself in 1867, and that we were leaving for our children to settle that respecting which I used the expression you will remember—I did not say in our generation—but I said that in the next generation the bayonet would do it, if we did not settle it by the ballot in this. (Loud cheers.)

This trouble was already lifting up its hideous head while we were fighting over matters of comparative unimportance. Let me show how. It was not four years that our united Parliament, constituted by the union of 1840, had been sitting before the parties became pretty evenly divided. A general election had been held and the parties came back, as I say, very evenly divided. The French Canadians, who are never very backward in asking what they want—(laughter)—had been yearly drawing attention to the disadvantages under which they pretended they were laboring in not being permitted the use of their own tongue, and were desirous of carrying out designs which even at that early time, some of the more reckless and daring among them had formed of establishing a French nationality in this country. Mr. Lafontaine pressed that matter with a good deal of vigor, and I think it was in the session of 1843, that he moved an address to the Crown asking that this “blot” in the Union Act, whereby English was declared to be the tongue of United Canada should be repealed; that they should be free in this country to use such language as they pleased and not be fettered or controlled by Imperial enactment. That was resisted. The orders sent from home were to resist that, but, as I told you, a general election took place, the parties came back almost equal and before poor Mr. Lafontaine had an opportunity to bring forward the resolution, which it was perfectly well known he proposed to repeat in the first session of the new Parliament, down

comes the government of the day and anticipates him by announcing as a government measure the very thing which Mr. Lafontaine had proposed the previous session, and which the Government had opposed. (Laughter.) When I read that in one of our recent histories, I thought we are not quite as bad as perhaps we think we are. (Renewed laughter.) We imagine we are wholly devoted to partyism, and perhaps there is some truth in it; but let me read to you an extract from the late Mr. Dent's History, and I think you will see that our ancestors fifty years ago were quite as abandoned in that respect as we are to-day. (Laughter).

"At the opening of the session of 1844-45, Mr. Lafontaine had it in contemplation to move an address to the Throne, praying that the existing restrictions upon the use of the French language should be removed. His intention having become known, the Government resolved to propitiate the favor of the French Canadian members by moving the address as a ministerial measure. There were positive instructions from the Colonial Office to the effect that no such disingenuous proceedings should be resorted to by the Provincial Administration; but the government's need of support was urgent, and, as Metcalfe's biographer naively remarks, 'it was expedient to disarm the Opposition.' Sir Charles gave his consent, and accordingly, on the 20th of December Mr. Papineau, Commissioner of Crown Lands, to the great surprise of the Opposition, moved the address. The motion was seconded by the Hon. George Moffat, member for Montreal, an ultra-Tory. It was received with tumultuous applause by the Assembly."

Why, a good deal like the Jesuit Act. Both sides were united—(applause)—and there was not even a noble thirteen—(cheers)—and it was similar in this, that it was to propitiate the French Canadians: but I think you will agree with me that we were at least thirteen better than they were in 1844. (Cheers.) Now, sir, that was within four years of the constitution of United Canada, and so fitted were we for self-government that we undid the good work which Lord Durham's wisdom had given us in the year 1840 or 1841. We have brought the trouble, therefore, on ourselves. There is nobody else to blame but the Canadian representatives and the Canadian politicians, and I suppose the people ought to be responsible for what the politicians do. So I have understood the rule to be. In four years afterwards, and in compliance with this address so unanimously carried, this clause was stricken out of the Act by the British Parliament. Now, before I am done with you to-night,

if you have the patience to remain until I am through, I will point out to you that this may be a very useful precedent ; that if in 1844 and 1845 the Parliament of united Canada could petition for the repeal of a clause of the Union Act, I do not know whether in 1890 or 1891, if the necessity arises the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada cannot petition for an amendment to the British North American Act also. (Cheers.) Well, I will bring you down a little later and I shall come to the time of Confederation. In the time of confederation, so strong and mighty had the French Canadian become that he was not satisfied with having the English language, as the only language, stricken out or rather eliminated from the Statute book, but he insisted and gained his point, by having it enacted by the British Parliament that in the Dominion of Canada—in the Parliament of that Dominion, and in the Parliament of the Province of Quebec—the French language should hold equal position with the English tongue. There for the first time, you find it recorded in an Act of Parliament that the French language was to have any status in this country. Trace it up. The clause in the treaty of 1763 guaranteed the freedom of religion to the conquered people—a guarantee which was nobly kept and which nobody desires to infringe. There was the Act of 1774, giving them the right to impose tithes—restoring to them their laws—but not the French language. There was the Act of 1791, by which the Legislative Assembly was given, but not the right to use the French language. Then there was the Act of 1840 or 1841, by which the French language was prohibited, and then the Act repealing that clause of 1841 in 1848. It was not until 1867 that the French Canadian power became so great as to insist and demand at the hands of the Imperial Parliament that the French language should be recognized throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion of Canada. That, we owe, rightly or wrongly to the public men of both sides. Blame not one more than another. We are all to blame. (Hear, hear.) The question is, are we to remain that way forever : or is there enough patriotism in this city and this Dominion to prompt men to stand out, knowing what is right and regardless of what party it may injure, and insist that this country is to be yet a British country ? (Cheers.)

Well, sir, since that time, has the influence of the French Canadian decreased or increased ? Has it grown greater or has it grown less ? Is the French Canadian to-day more English than he was at the time of the conquest, than he was in 1841, than he was in 1867 ? Sir, I have only been in public life for

twelve years, but to my certain knowledge the Frenchman is more French, so far as I can see, judging by his representatives in the House of Commons, and more French is spoken in the House than when I first came here in 1876, and it is still growing. You may say, "What has that to do with Equal Rights"? I venture to say it has a great deal to do with Equal Rights. If we are to continue in that course, dealing with this simple question alone; if we are to go on in this way, what is to be the end of it? I ask you, I ask any honest man in this assembly, What is to be the end of it? Why, some men will say, "Annexation—we will bury the Frenchman by annexation. The Americans understand how to settle this question, and annexation is the only solution." I deny it. (Loud cheers.) I say there shall be no annexation; I say there shall be no tearing up of the British North America Act; but within the limits of the constitution and by constitutional means is the remedy to be sought. It may not be to-day or to-morrow, but the day shall come when the question will be settled by the British people who inhabit the Northern part of the American continent. (Prolonged cheers.) Therefore it is that this Equal Rights Association was established. But not only that, sir: What have we to boast of as the outcome of the Act of Union? A Separate School system imposed on the people of free Ontario by their own votes? No. Search the records and you will find that the Act for the settlement of the Separate School question was imposed on the people of the Upper Province by the vote of the people of the Lower Province, and against the will of the people of the Upper Province. (Hear, hear.) Search the B. N. A. Act and you will see that it was attempted to be fastened on you for all time by this organic law, the B. N. A. Act, as a part of the bargain made at the time of Confederation. That and similar enactments have we to thank for the present state of affairs; that is the result of Lord Durham's well-meant labors. He brought us together, thinking that the English majority would ultimately govern; he brought us together with the belief that he was doing the greatest possible benefit to us and to them. We came together; we assembled in a common Parliament, but by the skilfull direction of the French Canadian vote, and the desire for power among the English and consequent division among them, the French Canadians were ultimately able to place their feet on our necks and impose laws on us contrary to our will, and we came out of the partnership taking the smaller share of the assets. (Hear, hear.) Before I turn from the discussion of Dominion politics, let me give you one

or two examples of the necessity of the Equal Rights Association. Whatever pretence, whatever ground there may have been for the permission of the dual language—the double language—in the old part, or that part of Canada where the Frenchmen existed when this country was conquered, will any honest man say by what pretence we are to perpetrate that iniquity in the great North West of this country? (Hear, hear.) Is there an argument to be used in favor of establishing two official languages in Manitoba and the North West? and if so, what is the argument? There were many Frenchmen living here, it was said. Certainly not in the North-West at the time the constitution such as it is was given to them. Possibly there were a few half-bred French in the Province of Manitoba; but look at the act of statesmanship, if it may be dignified by that name, of your public men—and again I say of both sides, because the Act giving a constitution to Manitoba was passed not without contest, not without motions and amendments; but I have searched the records and found that not a man raised his voice against the iniquitous clause—by which in the courts of law and the Legislative Hall of the great Province of Manitoba, the two languages were attempted to be foisted upon the people and put in such a way that they could never be got rid of; and so in the North West. Yet, it is said, there is no necessity for a new departure. We are to go on as we have been going, each following our political leader and fighting the issue of whether protection or free trade, or modified free trade, be the best for this country; or a grant to this railway or a bonus to that is to be the subject of consideration in the great Parliament of the Dominion, and while we go on planting these seeds, sure to bring forth trees bearing fruit of terrible misery to our descendants, there is to be no man to raise his voice in Parliament, or, if he does, he is to be denounced as a fanatic and an oppressor of minorities and so on (hear, hear). So with our schools. That question was settled, as I told you, in 1863: settled by the majority of the Lower Province although it concerned the affairs of the Upper Province. Not much provincial rights about that in those days (hear, hear). But since we have had provincial rights, since we have had our own separate parliament, what have we seen? Has there been any attempt to eradicate the Separate School System from our midst? No. But while that law stood, and properly so if there were to be separate schools, that every man must be assumed to be a public school supporter unless he chose himself to come out and insist on having a sep-

arate school; by a wily amendment to that law, passed in 1879 that right was practically denied to those amongst the Roman Catholics who preferred to have their children brought up with the common herd of us. So that any man, be he priest or layman, could go to the assessor and say A. B. and C. being Roman Catholics are presumed to be separate school supporters. I do not say that they could not get round that, but anyone who knows anything about Roman Catholicism, will regard him as a brave man, who, in the face of the powers that be, will say "I cease to be a separate school supporter" (hear, hear). We all know that. That has been done by our own little parliament in Toronto, without demur or opposition, and therefore by the unanimous consent of both political parties. Is it time then, there should be a new departure there? (cheers). Now, have I established good reasons why there should be a departure and for an Equal Rights Association? (cheers).

Let us face the manner in which we are attacked. What is said of us? "Some of us are, forsooth, sincere and conscientious; some of us are doing it for a purpose." I have been told by a distinguished minister of the crown—I saw it reported in the public press—that I am urged on by disappointed ambition (laughter). Well, I did not know that before, and when that gentleman and I are face to face I will ask him what he means (loud cheers). I am not going to make any boast. All I can say is that I have no ambition ungratified with regard to public affairs (renewed cheers). Others, we are told, are making use of this organization as a means for stirring up hatred, schism and bigotry between races and creeds. I do not deny—there is no use in denying it—that we are attacked on that ground, and that is more or less the effect of our organization, but I do deny that there is any cause for it. I do not deny that language is sometimes used on platforms which had better not have been uttered. But I would like to know what political revolution has been carried on without words being said which should not have been said; but I do say that the platform we have laid down has not a plank in it that any honest, honorable, straightforward man who loves his country will gainsay. (Loud cheers.) And while I admit that the French-Canadian will draw up into line and resist this reform, and while I am sorry to say it, I find the Roman Catholic drawing up into line and thinking that we are treading upon his corns, all I can say is, I think that is inevitable. What of the time to come? Are we to go on living as we are living? Are we to go on crying "peace, peace," when there is no

peace, or is there a time for us to assert our manhood, and has that time come yet? That is the reason of the genesis of the Equal Rights Association, and I am not ashamed to come here under your banner and address a number of my fellow-citizens, and declare I am ready, if necessary, to separate myself from my political associations, and stake my future, whatever that may be, on the success of the doctrines that we enunciate here. (Loud cheers.) The Jesuits Estates' Act, it has been very properly said, has given rise to this. It is the immediate cause of the formation of the Equal Rights Association; it has been the occasion of an agitation that has spread from one end of this Province, nay, from one end of the Dominion to the other, and when it becomes known it will be yet more widely diffused. But, although that is so, it is by no means anything more than the immediate, the proximate cause, as we lawyers might term it, of the outcry we have all seen, and most of us have felt during the past Summer. I confess I could not stand the Jesuits Estates Act; there was something to me revolting in it. I am not a bigot, I trust. Perhaps my religious feelings are not strong enough to constitute a bigot. I will be quite candid with you. I am willing that every man shall worship God in his own way and I would not raise a voice against him, but I have always been led to believe that the Jesuits, whenever they got into a community or a State were the cause of mischief, of trouble, of disorder, of anarchy (hear, hear), and ought to be suppressed, not in the interest of any religious denomination, or of religion at all, but in the interest of that peace and order which is essential to good government.

We see that they have been within the last week or two expelled from the late Empire of Brazil. (Applause.) They cannot be quite all that their good friends would picture them to be, and we know that there has been no pretence upon the part of the Jesuit body to renounce their early teachings or early practices. What they were at their formation in the days of Loyola, they are to-day. There is no doubt about that. A very distinguished friend of mine—I do not know whether it is right to use his remark or not—came up to me not long ago and said:—"I have not had an opportunity of seeing you." This gentleman is not in politics. He has been many years out of politics, and holds a distinguished position notwithstanding. There are men not in politics, quite distinguished. (Laughter.) He said:—"I want to shake you by the hand and congratulate you upon your vote on the Jesuits' Estates matter. I would

“have voted that way if it had put fifty Governments out of power.” He was a Conservative. “You might,” he said, “as well give a bounty on the importation of rattlesnakes.” (Laughter and applause.)

What drove me to the course I took was this, that the Act was based on the assumption that the British Crown had stolen the property from the Jesuit body; and the Act was carried out on the theory that His Holiness of Rome was the power to settle differences between the Crown—when I use the word “Crown” in this country I mean the State—and the subjects of that Crown. If the Act did not mean that, and you all remember that Sir John Thompson proved to 188 men that it did not mean that (laughter), why then, Mr. Mercier, as the framer of the Bill, the man who promoted it, certainly has a very false conception of his own measure; for he has recently told us—and I trust that those who voted for it are now satisfied about it—that it was the great act of his life; that he recognized no right in kings or people to keep stolen property any more than any one else; and the grand act of his life, an act which he summoned his young and innocent sons to witness, was the restitution of that money to the Jesuit Fathers, the returning of stolen goods to the Jesuits, as he did not many days ago in the City of Montreal. We know it was not stolen. (Applause.) We know perfectly well, or at least those amongst us who have chosen to study, that the Jesuit body had been dissolved by the Pope of Rome, for misconduct, before the cession of 1763, and were not in existence to claim property. And we know perfectly well that they could not be recognized, and as I have always thought, and I still adhere to that view, that they could not have been recognized by the laws of England and could not have been allowed to hold property at the time of the cession of this great country to the British Crown in 1763. Then we know that the gentlemen who were incorporated the other day were not in any shape or form the lineal descendants of that body, any more than if any half dozen of us had been incorporated and claimed the Jesuits Estates.

We know, also, that notwithstanding all that was said, that that money was practically handed over to the Pope of Rome, and he did not give it to the Jesuits, because he knew they had no particular claim to it (laughter), but he parcelled it among the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada, part of it going to the University of Quebec and part to the Jesuit College of Montreal. Those of us who voted against that Act, I think, have been

amply justified, and must in the sight of all honest men be held to have been justified for their vote on that occasion. (Cheers.) But after all, as I say, it was but a small matter. We have a record for eight months, Mr. Chairman—I mean the Equal Rights Association—which no political party could boast of in a decade of years, and if there are men among us now who want to go back to their old political alliance, I say, shame on them! They ought to be satisfied with what we have accomplished in so short a time. (Loud cheers.) What have we accomplished? Go to the Province of Manitoba and what do we see there? Why, that the Government is going to deal, not only with the dual language question and the iniquitous Act which would fasten it upon them, but with Separate Schools. I had the honor to stand upon the same platform at Portage la Prairie with the Attorney-General of the Province, when he announced his intention, in anticipation of the action of his Government, that he would cease to sign the official cheque for the publication of the statutes in the dual language or cease to be the Attorney-General. (Cheers.) Do you tell me that the Equal Rights Association had nothing to do with that? Of course, the feeling was there; the grievance existed. People's minds had only to be directed to it, and the moment attention was drawn to it the Province of Manitoba rose to a man and said, "We want no dual language, and away with Separate Schools as well." (Applause.) Let me prove what I say is correct. There ought to be no sympathy between Attorney-General Martin and myself according to old political doctrines. He is a Reformer and I a Conservative; therefore we should be sworn foes. But the people of Manitoba do not view the matter so. When Mr. Pendergast, the French representative in the Cabinet, resigned on account of the announced policy of the Manitoba Government, and Mr. McLean was appointed Provincial Secretary in his place, the Conservative party called a convention, nominated a candidate to oppose the new Provincial Secretary in Mr. Greenway's Government. The gentleman who received the nomination—I forget his name for the moment—went among his would-be constituents, saw them and finding that the feeling was strong in favor of the policy of the Government in reference to the dual language system and Separate Schools, that it was useless for him to oppose any man in favor of it and therefore he withdrew from the contest (hear). Is not that a proof of what is going on in Manitoba. And in the North-west—our Great North-west—what of it? Why at the last meeting of their Legislative As-

sembly they passed a resolution, with practical unanimity—the minority consisted but of two—addressed to the House of Commons, to the Senate, and to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying that next session the dual language clause should be struck out of the Act, and I have undertaken the task—and a more glorious task I never undertook—(loud cheers)—that I shall be the mover of that bill. (Renewed cheers). I pledged myself to it before I went to the North-west, I renewed the pledge at the meeting which I addressed there, I said to the meeting, “I care not whether you aid me by your petition or not; I look upon this as a matter of so much vital concern, affecting not merely the North-west but the whole Dominion, that I shall move in it, but I ask you to strengthen me by your petition,” and as I said, the petition was practically carried by almost an unanimous vote. (Loud cheers.) And Separate Schools they ask to be allowed to deal with. Now, I would like you to point to any other political organization or association, that, in the short space of eight or nine months, has accomplished what we have accomplished. We may not have obtained grants of public money: truly we have not. But we have been the means of initiating the greatest reforms that have been proposed in my day at all events, and I believe in the days of the oldest man I have the honor to address here this evening (hear, hear). Do we rest there? We were told during the last session of the Ontario Legislature that the schools in the eastern part of this Province, where it was asserted that the French were gradually creeping in and displacing the Englishmen, electing their own trustees, appointing French teachers, bringing in French books not authorized by the Council of Public Instruction, and in point of fact widening the boundaries of the Province of Quebec—we were told that was a mere delusion. Truly there was a little of that kind of thing going on but not very much. Everything was quite satisfactory. But the Equal Rights Associations, met in convention. They fulminated their thunders, and the result was a Commission to investigate this matter, which did not require investigation about six weeks before. (Applause.) The report of that Commission was made and I read in the speech which Mr. Mowat delivered in Woodstock, he claimed great credit for giving immediate effect to that Commission. Had we nothing to do with that I wonder? If the Equal Rights Association had never been formed, and there had been no agitation in the Province of Ontario, do you think there would have been any change in the schools of the Eastern part?

A voice.—No.

MR. MCCARTHY.—That ought to satisfy the ambition of most men ; but I am not quite satisfied yet.

A voice.—Go on.

MR. MCCARTHY.—We will go on ? (Great cheering.) And what do you say about Separate Schools ? I have read Mr. Mowat's utterances almost as carefully as I ought to read another book. I study them, because I know he is a careful, cautious, canny politician. I say not a word against him. You know this is all a scheme. I am Sir John Macdonald's tool. I am going through this country for the purpose of getting Mr. Mowat out of power. I am not to injure Sir John Macdonald, but if possible to destroy the little Premier. So bear in mind anything I say in that connection must be taken *cum grano*. I notice Mr. Mowat has paid particular attention to the Separate School question. He says : " At one time we were not giving the Catholics justice. At another time it is ' No Popery,' and now ' No Popery and No French.' " He says :—" I fall back on the administrative acts of my Government and challenge any attack on my administration of the public affairs of this Province." The Equal Rights Association are not dealing with that. We leave that to the Opposition. We are dealing with certain great principles, and I may state that we are going to hew to the line, and are not particular where the chips fall. (Applause.) And so, although Mr. Mowat has not had anything to do with the Jesuits Estates' Act, and had nothing to do with the drawing of the Act—of which he was foully accused—and had nothing to do with Mr. Mercier, we shall continue. I notice he is rather ashamed of Mr. Mercier at present, and even the *Globe* is thinking that Mr. Mercier is going a little too far. It rather threatens him if he does so and so. And Mr. Mowat, too, is getting ashamed of his companionship.

But when all is said and done, Mr. Mowat is paying the most marked attention to the feeling about Separate Schools. That is a tribute to the agitation we have raised, and if nothing comes of it it will be because Mr. Mowat is so circumstanced that he cannot help himself. Give him a fair fling and I would not be at all surprised if the two clauses which were inserted in the Act in 1877 and 1879, I believe, and which are so much in dispute come out of the Act very shortly. Mr. Mowat has recently submitted to the Courts a case, and he wants the Courts to tell the public what his Act of Parliament means. (Laughter). Don't laugh at that because it is the very greatest compliment Mr.

Mowat could have paid us. Of course, we know, that if Mr. Mowat was really anxious to cut the connection with the other party and to come out squarely as the Mr. Mowat of ancient days would have done, he would not have hesitated to have passed a Declaratory Act—a familiar form of legislation, by the way, in his Assembly, defining the meaning of the law. (Laughter). Catholic journals say the Act means what it says, or that it ought to mean what it says, that is, that every Roman Catholic is presumed to be a supporter of Separate Schools. We say he should be presumed to be a supporter of Public Schools. Mr. Mowat could have settled that by one stroke of his pen, but, instead, he has gone through the farce of asking a Court of Law to say what this Act means. Perhaps my Conservative friends will say “You are destroying the party; you are not going to get any Reformers to leave Mr. Mowat, the Reformers will hang together to support Mr. Mowat, and the end will be to split up the Conservative party.” I hope that it will not be so. I hope that the Conservative party will stand on the platform of Equal Rights. (Cheers). I do not care whether the Reformers do or do not stick to Mr. Mowat. An honest man be he Reformer or Conservative, won’t stick to Mr. Mowat, or Sir John Macdonald or anybody else in this matter. (Renewed cheers.) If public opinion is not ripe; if people are not sufficiently educated to put mutual trust in one another, by and by, when they see we are honest, when they see we are not serving a double purpose, but have only a single eye to the good of the country, men of all classes will rally round us. (Loud cheers.) At present they distrust us. A few days ago I read a letter which gave an account of a curious incident which happened in West Lambton during the recent local election in that constituency. Forty Conservatives in one polling sub-division put their names down to vote for the Third Party candidate, and forty Reformers. When in the evening the ballots were counted it was found that only forty votes had been cast altogether for Mr. McCree. (Laughter.) The Conservatives say the Reformers went back on them, and the Reformers return the compliment. It is quite plain, however, that forty men on one side or the other did not keep their pledges, and it just shows the feeling of mistrust which prevails on account of the political differences which have hitherto insanely separated the people of this country. (Hear, hear.) So much for what we have done; so much for our reasons for doing it, and now have we any reason to disband to night? (Loud cries of “No.”) Have we any reason to continue the fight? (“Yes, yes.”)

We ought to be satisfied with what we have accomplished. For my part I never felt so proud of any political movement as that in which we have been engaged this Summer. For my part I am willing to continue in the way we are moving. True it is, we do not know where we may be at the close of the next session (Hear, hear). We know this question about the North West Territory is to come up in the House of Commons, and how will the parties vote? Is that to be supported by thirteen, or will there be as many as thirteen? (Applause). What will they say of Provincial Rights, I wonder? (Applause). The great North-West Territories' Assembly desire to get rid of the dual language. It has unanimously petitioned in favor of it. We will hear, I dare say, some hair splitting before the session is over. (Laughter and applause). I do not think there will be practical unanimity. I think the French Canadian desires, nor merely that he should have his language, as his Institutions and his laws, in the Province of Quebec; but his ambition is to carry it to the Province of Ontario, and thence to Manitoba and the North West, and ultimately, if he can, to subdue this country to Frenchmen, or to make of it a French nationality. And he will die game. There will be no backdown on the part of the French Canadian. Already in Manitoba there has been meeting after meeting in the French parishes protesting against the abolition of the French language and of the doing away with the Separate Schools.

I am not in the confidence of the party, and do not know what the Conservatives are to do. One observation fell from one of the speakers to-night which calls from me for a disclaimer. I will gratify the *Free Press*. It has been asking ever since the 24th of May, practically daily, and one time sent an interviewer to know what I had to say about it. It was said I am still the Executive head of the Conservative party in this Province. Sir, I have not held that position for the last seven or eight months (cheers). I may state that, and I do state it, and I will tell you why I resigned. It was honestly and fairly put to me: "Your position as the executive head of the Party, for the organization of the Party—for that is all I was—makes your vote on the Jesuit Estates' Act more damaging to us than the course of twenty other men would be." I felt there was force in this argument, and that it was my duty at once to withdraw. (Cheers.) That is a family matter, so to speak, but when it was said I was still the head of the Party, and credit given me on that account for taking the position I had taken, it was only fair that I should let you into the secret, if secret it may

be. I am not in a position to tell you what the Conservative party are going to do about it—the Dual Language question—but I am inclined to think, from what I saw in an address in a constituency recently opened, that we may guess what Mr. Laurier's course will be. In that constituency, Richelieu, which was carried by the Conservatives by over 400 of a majority, it was claimed by Mr. Laurier's candidate that he, (Mr. Laurier,) would be the protector of the French Canadians in all the Provinces of the Dominion. That may be the course Mr. Laurier intends to pursue, but whatever course he intends to pursue, we have to realize that a great struggle is before us (Hear hear). You are very unanimous here to-night; but I dare say to-morrow, when you go out into the cold, your feelings may undergo a change equal to the temperature, and you will not be so hot about equal rights or other questions. When asked if you are going to desert your old party chief, you will feel that you will not turn your back upon him. So it is going to be in other constituencies all through the Province; but I tell you that while the Equal Rights Association may not be able to return many representatives to the next Parliament, they will, without doubt, be able to control who shall be returned. (Cheers). Look at West Lambton. I am told that shows the weakness of the Equal Rights movement. In the first place the gentleman who ran there was not the candidate of the Equal Rights Association. He was the candidate of a party of which Dr. Sutherland is the founder, and which is known as the Third Party.

It is perfectly true that the local branch of the Equal Rights Association, which, perhaps, has not been very active or energetic in that part of the Province, did ask the three gentlemen who were seeking the suffrages of the people whether they accepted the platform of the Equal Rights Association or not, and as Mr. McRae was the only one who endorsed it, he was promised such support as the local association could give. But put it as you please 700 or 800 men came out with a perfect knowledge that they could not elect their man, and voted for him. When I was in Sarnia I was told Mr. McRae would receive 200 votes, about equally from each party. When the day came, however, he polled 700 or 800 votes from men who knew that their ballots were practically thrown away, but knowing that they were entering a protest as freemen against the system which prevailed (cheers). Now, sir, there is not a constituency in the Province—I am not speaking beyond that—in which the Equal

Rights Association cannot control the election of a man, if they cannot elect their man. (Hear hear.) There may not be many of us, but there are always some men willing to put country before party; (cheers) always some men willing to do the right and not be led away by specious cries, such as the politicians are apt to use to coax men into line, and they will be ample to carry success on our banner, in one sense or another at the next general election (applause). I have not much more to say to you, ladies and gentlemen. I thank you heartily for the attentive hearing you have given me, but I ask you just to pause and consider whether there is not really a danger; a substantial danger in things as they exist at present. It is not at all open to question that a party in the Province of Quebec be it little or be it great—and I will deal with that in a moment—is openly proclaiming that the object and intent of the French Canadians is to establish a French Canadian nation in our midst. (Hear hear.) Now, Mr. Mercier is the leading man in Quebec to-day. He is the Premier of the Province, and if I understand it aright, he has carried every election, no matter whether held by a former supporter of his or by an oppositionist, that has been contested, except in the county of Brome, which is two-thirds English. Mr. Mercier's words are therefore not to be considered as the wild vaporings of a man without position, influence or responsibility. And what does Mr. Mercier say? He told it openly, to an immense meeting of his fellow-countrymen at the great French Canadian celebration last June, that it was his desire to unite the Blues and the Rouges and to fight the battle under the tri-color and practically, that he looked forward to the establishment of a French nationality. We know that, at the same time, a part of the same programme was calling upon His Holiness, the Pope of Rome, to bless the young French Canadian nation established on the banks of the St. Lawrence; we know that there is a paper called, *La Verité* which has considerable influence in the Province of Quebec, and which flatly tells us that the position at present is one of transition, and that the French Canadians' look forward to no amalgamation with other nationalities, such as we hope to see in this country, but to the establishment of a French Canadian nationality. The editor has put that in words which are unmistakeable. Let me read them to you:

"But," it continues, "such was not, is not, never will be the desire of French Canadians. For us, Confederation was and is the means to an end."

It is a means of enabling us to dwell in peace with our English neighbors, whilst safe guarding our rights, developing our resources, strengthening us, and making us ready for our national future. Let us say it boldly—the ideal of the French Canadian people is not the ideal of the other races which to-day inhabit the land our fathers subdued for Christian civilization. Our ideal is the formation here, in this corner of the earth watered by the blood of our heroes, of a nation which shall perform on this continent the part France has played so long in Europe. Our aspiration is to found a nation which, socially, shall profess the Catholic faith and speak the French language. That is not and cannot be the aspiration of the other races. To say then that all the groups which constitute Confederation are animated by one and the same aspiration, is to utter a sounding phrase without political or historical meaning. For us the present form of government is not and cannot be the last word of our national existence. It is merely a road towards the goal which we have in view, that is all. Let us never lose sight of our own national destiny. Rather let us constantly prepare ourselves to fulfil it worthily at the hour decreed by Providence, which circumstances shall reveal to us. Our whole history proves that it is not to be a vain dream, a mere Utopia, but the end which the God of nations has marked out for us. We have not been snatched from death a score of times; we have not multiplied with a rapidity truly prodigious; we have not wrought harvests of resistance and of peaceful conquest in the Eastern townships and in the border counties of Ontario; we have not absorbed many of the English and Scotch settlements planted among us in order to break up our homogeneity; we have not put forth all these efforts and seen them crowned with success, to go and perish miserably in any all-Canadian arrangement.”

Is that plain? Is there any doubt about that meaning? Now, I could read you others. Mr. Laurier came to Toronto, as you know, a little while ago, and he announced there very liberal sentiments. He returned to his Province to be met by denunciation from *La Verité*, which said his were not French Canadian sentiments. He was also denounced by *La Presse*. He had to go into a fight in the constituency of Richelieu, rendered vacant by the death of Captain Labelle, and was beaten by over 400 hundred, probably on account of the views he had proclaimed at Toronto. The policy has been generally proclaimed by the leading newspapers and men of the Province that a French nationality is desired. I acknowledge, and I have the right to assume, that when these gentlemen tell us, as one or two of them have announced, that they have no such ambition, they are speaking the honest truth; but if they have no such ambition what are we to say of Mr. Mercier's position? It is said he is doing it to keep himself in power. Why, if he is doing it to keep himself in power, he is pandering to the wishes of his fellow-countrymen. (Applause.) We must face this aspiration of his fellow-countrymen. We must cry out against it, and we must do it by banding ourselves together; not to do

injustice to French Canadians—God forbid—and not to perpetrate a wrong to any citizen. (Cheers.) I look for the day when there will be French Canadians with hearts large enough and minds comprehensive enough to take in the situation, and to see that this is but an idle dream that can never be realized. Talk of a nation to perform on this continent the part played by Old France! Surely Anglo-Saxons will never tolerate the pranks Old France played in Europe. Surely any man must see that this is preposterous folly, wild fancies, madness, and yet the feeling, the policy of practical politicians is there and must be taken account of. I hope and look forward however, for some large-minded Frenchman who will come out among the people of his Province, and in the face of the cures, say, “I am for British nationality and will endeavor to bring my people into line for a British country.” (Cheers.) We should receive such a man with open arms, and we should encourage everything of that kind, no matter whence it emanates. (Hear.) We have no hostility to Quebec, their good is our good. They are being extirpated from the land,—are being driven away in hundreds of thousands by the iniquitous tithe law imposed by the Act of 1774—consecrated by the Act of 1867. What does history teach us. It is a poor farming country in Quebec, or possibly it is farmed by a poor class of farmers. The people are already over-burdened and they are fleeing by hundreds of thousands from these burdens. I saw a statement the other day that 200 heads of families in Rimouski have disappeared across the borders within a few months. Is it to be wondered at? Do you think that people will continue for centuries to be tied down by tithes, fabrique, assessments, etc., when there is a land of freedom for them across the border. If it is an object to us to keep our people here, I want to see the French Canadians kept here so long as their interests are not antagonistic to the rest of the Dominion, and this can only be obtained by doing away with laws of this kind. (Loud cheers.) When we look back to 1844-5, and at the action of the Imperial Parliament, I think we can well ask them to give us power to amend our constitution by eliminating such parts as are inimical to the public weal. Are we to be told that in this 19th century this law is unchanged and unchangeable? Are we to have Separate Schools in Upper Canada, tithe assessments in Lower Canada, dual language in the Dominion Parliament, and dual languages in Quebec. the North-west and Manitoba? Are we to be denied the right of free men, or consistently with Imperial interests and the duty we owe to the Crown, and with

proper safeguards should we not have the same rights that others have had to alter the Constitution ; to amend it, and to have the obnoxious clauses obliterated from it ? (Cheers). I trust the day will come when these matters will find a place in our platform. I am not tied down by the Convention. I accept what it did, but I claim the right of perfect freedom of action. What that platform is, is simply for the expunging or repeal of the amendment to the Separate School Law, so that the law will be restored to its position in 1863. It asks that French shall cease to be taught in our schools, or rather that the teaching in our schools shall be English. I have no antipathy to the French language, but desire that our children may be instructed from our school books in the English tongue. There is no difficulty about that. A practical teacher will tell you that as the child comes lisping to his knee he could teach him in any language. It is all a farce this proposed bi-lingual series. If you allow that to be foisted upon you, you will have more French taught there than English ; but let the law be that the teachers to be placed in the French settled parts of the Province shall be English-speaking men with a competent knowledge of the French language, whose interest it will be that the children shall be taught English and there will be no difficulty in the way. No matter what the school-books or course of teaching may be ; whether the same be bi-lingual or any other device you may hit on, if the teacher is French his sympathies as well as those of the trustees and the parents of the children being not to Anglize, but to keep the children French—the plan will prove abortive. Certainly English may be taught as an accomplishment, because it is well that the child should know the language, but it will be as a foreign tongue and not as the language of the country.

Now sir, I have already occupied too much of your time. I am exceedingly gratified to this large and intelligent audience for the hearing they have given me, and I can only say that I have been encouraged very much by the feeling which I think prevails in the capital of the Dominion. You have the difficulties here more clearly defined than they have in other parts of Canada, and your duties and responsibilities are correspondingly great. We in the other and western parts of the Province hope and look forward with confidence to your action when the time comes for that action. It is not by mere assembling together in meetings that good is to be done. It is when the time comes for political action ; when the elections are upon you. That is where we look and expect to see results. Trusting

air, as I do, with great confidence in that result, believing that you can control if you cannot elect—for you can control the election in this constituency—and that you will exert yourselves, not merely here but in the surrounding constituencies, I will have pleasure in reporting to my friends in Toronto, that notwithstanding what was said about the dying out of the Equal Rights feeling it still lives in the hearts of the people of Ottawa. (Continued cheering.)



